3: Reay E-4, 5 (1951) 1953 OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

Conclusion

In conclusion, it could be said that the Orokaiva have a fairly weak system of social control. The sanctions against wrongdoing are all diffuse, and do not always work successfully. There seems to be a complete absence of any effective judicial system. A thief or a murdering sorcerer has to be caught in the act to be punished at all. There is no machinery for discovering the culprit.[10] In a domestic crisis, a woman will "retaliate" by leaving her husband ostensibly with no one to cook for him, but it is easy for him to find someone willing to do his cooking. He does this by invoking pity. If a situation is unbearable, an individual can always leave the village. A woman can go to her kinsfolk, and a man to his *naname's* village.

The only person an Orokaiva can punish effectively is himself. There seems to be a good deal of impotent rage in the destruction of a man's own property in a fit of *sisira*. Also, the wronged man is sorry for himself, and he ensures that everyone else, including the person who wronged him, feels sorry for him, too. The masochistic sanction of self-injury, with the purpose of invoking the criminal's pity, is in direct contrast to the outward aggression of the Orokaiva's traditional relations with the hostile Tagaho and Managalasi. It is possible that the weakness of the internal judicial system was originally due to the necessity for keeping overt aggression geared towards the enemy groups. To maintain constant warfare with outsiders, internal aggression had to be severely limited, even aggression towards wrongdoers. Hence, perhaps, the unwillingness to ferret out the culprit when a theft occurs or a person dies from sorcery, unless the criminal is actually caught in the act.

The relationship between institutionalized friendship and social control is ambiguous. A man's *naname* are his contemporaries who were secluded with him in the *oro* during his initiation, and other friends he may acquire later. Every man has many *naname* scattered throughout neighbouring and distant villages. Being somebody's *naname* constitutes a bond which overrides all other considerations. A man's loyalty to his *naname* is said to be stronger than his loyalty to his family and his relatives. Although, theoretically, a man who is *otohu* never quarrels and brawls, if he is involved in brawls in defence of a *naname* he is paradoxically judged to be more *otohu* than ever. So strong is the bond between *naname* that in fact men cannot conceive of committing offences against anyone who stands in this relationship to them.[11] This attitude tends to be extended to friends of a man's *naname*, so normally there are very few people in the community who are potential victims of, say, a man's impulse to steal. Considered as an instrument of social control, institutionalized friendship minimizes the possibility of deviance.

Formerly, the conduct of wars and cannibal raids was determined largely by this institution. The Koropata people who went to help their allies at Isivita in a

[10] L. A. Flint (*Papuan Annual Report*, 1924–25, p. 43) describes various ways of tracing the sorcerer, but says nothing of the effectiveness of these methods. Certainly in 1951 the Wasida and Koropata people seemed sceptical of these methods and said that they did not bother trying to discover the sorcerer by these means.

[11] One informant went so far as to say that if a man were to discover that he had committed some offence against his *naname* "by mistake," he would kill himself.

3: Reay E-4, 5 (1951) 1953 OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

572 war against the Managalasi were those who had friends at Isivita and those who were friends (*naname*) of men already committed by friendship to go. The conduct of warfare depended upon these personal links between *naname*, who had a binding obligation to fight for one another. The Wasida people still say of their traditional enemies (the Togaho, the Managalasi, and the Orokaiva of Sairope), "We have no friends among them." Having no friends among them, and having no friends in common with them, they were free to fight.

Institutionalized friendship also operates against social control, in regard to the consequences of wrongdoing. If a man is driven from his own village by shame for a wrong he has committed, he is welcomed by his *naname*, whose hospitality is always ready. It is impossible for a man to be a social outcast, as he can stay in his *naname's* village as long as he likes as a welcome and honoured guest.

Therefore, social control amongst the Orokaiva is perhaps weaker than it is in the more formalized societies, because of the internal stresses imposed by constantly recurring warfare, and because also the efficient conduct of wars and cannibal raids involved the institutionalization of friendship to such a degree that it provides, even to-day, a loophole for the deviant. On the other hand, this institution itself tends to minimize the possibility of deviance by providing each man with a category of people towards whom it is inconceivable that he should act otherwise than in strict accordance with the *otohu* ideals.

MARIE REAY.